REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are currently pending. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended herein to correct typographical errors. Claims 8 and 9 have been added herein. The claims add the limitation to their respective base claims that the controller acts during the input analyzation process. The added limitation is disclosed throughout the specification and specifically as noted at page 21, line 7 to page 22, line 13.

Applicant's representatives thank the Examiner for conducting the interview for this action on September 27, 2004. Applicant's remarks regarding the interview are incorporated below.

As noted in the interview, claims 4 and 5 have been switched back to "objected to" status for dependency on rejected base claims. Applicant respectfully refers to the supplemental amendment filed October 7, 2003 in which Applicant placed the claims in independent form. According to the Patent Office's automatic information retrieval (PAIR), the amendment is on file. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment has been entered for independent claims 4 and 5.

Applicant's Response to the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action has restructured the rejections of claims 1-3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ito et al.* (USP 5,724,154) in view of *Sugaya* (USP 6,304,336).

Specifically, as noted during the interview, the Office Action has maintained the last rejection verbatim as to the disclosure of *Ito et al.* and restructured the rejection so as to indicate that *Sugaya* discloses the missing limitation of *Ito et al.* The limitation not in

7

Ito et al. is: (1) creating drawing data for a designated resolution; (2) controller changes said designated resolution to a drawer one; (3) repeats an input data canalization process from the beginning of the input data when controller detects a memory shortage; and (4) prints at a lower print resolution (current Office Action, page 3, section 2).

Applicant respectfully submits that *Sugaya et al.* does not disclose these limitations. Applicant refers to the arguments set forth during the interview, and set forth and expanded upon as follows.

The Office Action points to col. 8, line 55 to col. 9, line 9 and col. 10, lines 7-14, as disclosing these limitations. The sections the Office Action points to do show data is read from a page buffer. Next bitmap data corresponding band is placed in band memory. ". . . intermediate in this case is generated corresponding to the resolution . . . which [is] designated by the host computer." The data is compressed and stored in cache memory. This process is repeated until all intermediate data corresponding to all bands are classified and stored. The disclosure is attempting to prevent jaggy or notch in the bitmap data (col. 8, lines 61-62). As then set forth, in col. 10, in regard to printing, a form image is generated according to print resolution and paper size. The coded form image is stored in the cache images.

As relayed during the interview, the above features of *Sugaya et al.* do not correspond to (1) the controller; (2) the step of detecting memory shortage; (3) the step of changing resolution data based on memory shortage and (4) printing at the lower resolution based on the memory shortage as required by current claim 1.

8

Specifically, regarding the recitation "when said controller detects a memory shortage", there is no description corresponding thereto in either Figs. 3 and 4, or in the specification in columns 8-10 in *Sugaya*.

Regarding the recitation "said controller changes said designated printing resolution to a lower printing resolution", although there is a description in column 10 in *Sugaya* that "a form image is generated according to the print resolution . . .", this print resolution is not changed according to the condition of memory shortage, in contrast with the present invention.

Regarding the recitation "(the controller) repeats an input data analyzation process beginning with said input data entered for the first page of said job", referring to Figs. 3 and 4 and the corresponding description in the specification in *Sugaya*, only when processing corresponding to 1 to form (all bands, one page) is completed, such as shown in steps S303, S307, S312, S317, and S318, does the flow go back to the preceding step, and the process is repeated. Therefore, Applicant submits that *Sugaya* does not disclose the present invention in which the process is repeated when "memory shortage" is detected.

During the interview, the Examiner pointed to column 17, lines 16-47 of *Sugaya et al.* as possibly demonstrating an embodiment similar to that claimed. As noted during the interview, although *Sugaya et al.* is discussing shortage of cashe memory for resolution size, there is no teaching in this section to a controller for adjusting to a lower resolution upon detecting such a memory shortage.

As these key limitations are missing from *Sugaya et al.*, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be possible for one skilled in the art to derive the currently

claimed invention of current claims 1 and 7 based on a combination of *Ito et al.* and

Sugaya et al. Wherefore, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that this application is now in

condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that this application is not in

condition for allowance, Examiner is encouraged to contact the Applicants' undersigned

attorney at the telephone number below to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for

an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time

and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No.

50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

By: _____
Stephen G. Adrian
Reg. No.: 32,878
Attorney for Applicant
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111

MJC/SGA/rer